

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

LOREN M. BEY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	No. 3:15-CV-1406-M-BH
)	
GREYHOUND LINES, INC.,)	
et al.,)	
Defendants.)	Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to *Special Order No. 3-251*, this case has been automatically referred for screening. Based on the relevant filings and applicable law, the case should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute or follow orders of the court.

I. BACKGROUND

Loren M. Bey (Plaintiff) filed this case and moved to proceed *in forma pauperis* on May 5, 2015. Plaintiff was granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and he was sent a questionnaire (“MJQ”) on January 7, 2016, to obtain more information about his claims. (*See* doc. 11.) The questionnaire specifically advised Plaintiff that his answers to the questions were due within fourteen days, and that a failure to file his answers could result in the dismissal of his case. *Id.* More than fourteen days from the date of the questionnaire have passed, but Plaintiff has not filed his answers to the questionnaire.

II. INVOLUNTARY DISMISSAL

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permits a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or follow orders of the court. *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988). This authority flows from a court’s inherent power to control its docket, prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases, and avoid congested court calendars. *Link*

v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-31 (1962). Plaintiff has failed to comply with the January 7, 2016, order requiring that he file answers to the questionnaire within fourteen days. It appears that he does not intend to proceed with this case, and it should therefore be dismissed under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute or follow orders of the Court.

III. RECOMMENDATION

This case should be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution or failure to follow court orders pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), unless Plaintiff files his answers to the questionnaire within the time for objecting to this recommendation, or some other deadline set by the Court.

SIGNED this 19th day of February, 2016.


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT

A copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions and recommendation must file specific written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE